

due to the dry detention basin as well as buffered by a cul de sac.

Novack went on to explain that two noise models were conducted, that the first did not include the ICN development and the second model incorporated a fully built-out ICN in 40 years and resulted in a difference of few decibels.

Council discussed the appropriateness of spending money on a few residents if the property does not meet warrants, impact of electric vehicle mandates on traffic noise, assessment fee savings, requests for sound walls from residents on truck routes, applying the \$2M to the 248th Avenue improvement project instead of the sound walls, and establishing an SSA for residents that want a sound wall.

Novack explained the attached maps, the five criteria that was run, and the green and red location designations.

Council discussed the cost per home, appropriateness of building the wall where the criteria was barely met/missed, creating an SSA for vacant lots to be paid by the developer, and ensuring sight lines are clear.

Council continued to discuss community benefit of sound walls, the 75th Street improvement, the impact of electric vehicles.

A motion was made by Councilman Hinterlong, seconded by Councilwoman Gustin, to direct staff to install noise walls only at warranted locations (Option 1).

A motion in substitution was made by Councilman Kelly, seconded by Councilman Holzhauser, to staff to install noise walls at warranted and unwarranted locations (Option 2). The motion failed by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Bruzan Taylor, Holzhauser, Kelly, and White

Nay: 5 - Chirico, Gustin, Hinterlong, Leong, and Sullivan

A motion was made by Councilman Hinterlong, seconded by Councilwoman Gustin, to direct staff to install noise walls only at warranted locations (Option 1). The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 9 - Chirico, Bruzan Taylor, Gustin, Hinterlong, Holzhauser, Kelly, Leong, Sullivan, and White

2. [Consider the three options regarding the Affordable Housing Incentive Program and direct staff accordingly - PZC 22-1-017](#)

Michael Ryder (Naperville - DuPage Housing Alliance) spoke in support of the plan.

Amanda Zahorak (Chicago - DuPage Habitat for Humanity) spoke in support of the plan.

Andrew Sparks (Chicago - DuPage Habitat for Humanity) spoke in support of the plan.

Trey Phillips (Naperville - DuPage Housing Alliance) spoke in support of the

plan.

Phil Meno (Naperville - DuPage Housing Alliance) spoke in support of the plan.

Marilyn L Schweitzer (Naperville) spoke against the plan and in favor of moving forward with affordable housing initiatives.

Laff explained that in order for an R1A property to qualify for the AHIP it would need to have at least five units on it by right, if they set aside a portion for affordable then they would get a density bonus and other waivers, however in no instance can a developer put a use on an R1A property that would not be permitted in that zoning district. She concluded by emphasizing R1A only permits single-family homes and variances are not permitted without a public rezoning process.

Council stated that this topic has been through significant public input processes, SB Friedman did exactly what was asked, that the proposal is creative, and that Option 3 is not the answer.

Brad Wilson, Naperville Park District Executive Director, discussed the two letters submitted regarding the AHIP and stated the primary concern is the "by right" provision. He also discussed the concern of a reduction/waiver of land cash donation, stated the preference is to continue a case-by-case evaluation, and described capacity issues in programming. Wilson also explained that Fort Hill Activity Center, Centennial Beach renovations, and Nike expansions were made possible in part from development land cash donations.

Council questioned Wilson regarding the Park District letters, specifically the Municipal Code reference to low income families, discussed national studies regarding low income youth participation in sports, and gave fee assistance statistics.

Laff explained that the Municipal Code establishes different populations in which to determine donations.

Wilson discussed the Park District's commitment to inclusion, reiterated the concern over the "by right" provision, described a recent senior housing development where the Park District worked with the developer to lower the fees and create a trail amenity for residents, and explained that the Park District offers low cost as well as free programming that low income families utilize.

Council asked for five-acre examples of R1 and R1A properties, a prioritized list of vacant lots for affordable development, and clarification on AHIP recommendations beyond SB Friedman presentations.

Laff stated that the Naper Commons park donation was \$1.9 million.

Council discussed not continuing with SB Friedman, approving Option 3 and having staff offer clarifications on incentives, density bonus, and the elimination of R1A references.

Council also discussed not reducing land cash donations, that developments are planned that have affordable housing components, NOAH, and exploring other governmental agencies that can bear some financial burden.

Council stated it is not comfortable with where they are today, don't want to be stuck in analysis paralysis, that the most consensus has been around eliminating R1A altogether, that the Park District is one of seven potential incentives available and should be able to program for the number of residents, the need for further discussion between City and Park District, questioned where did 50% come from, the amount/degree of incentives, that the state has set the goal at 10% but is it appropriate to set it at 20%, and that staff should refine the program requiring more units and less of a density bonus, eliminate R1A, and talk further with the Park District.

WRITTEN COMMENTS ONLY

Kathleen McGowan (Naperville) - The Naperville Senior Task Force On behalf of the Naperville Senior Task Force, we are pleased that the City is contemplating further action on the proposals submitted by the Friedman group's work. While we support, in principle, getting more affordable housing into Naperville, we do have some reservations about the resolution in front of you at your October 4th City Council meeting. We agree with some of our colleagues who have questioned the wisdom of limiting the public participation in the approval process of these projects. We understand that developers may need incentives to build affordable housing in our community. However, it does seem that the public must be involved in the process. Eliminating or limiting that participation seems ill-advised. We also question the amount of leeway given to developers regarding waiver of fees being proposed and how that could impact the Park District and their programs as well as other public services such as libraries, schools, etc. We all have a difficult job ahead of us. One of our tasks is to educate the public about the realities of affordable housing, not promoting fears or anxieties. We also must provide a process that enables the City to continue the service they so ably provide while giving incentives to developers to encourage their buy-in. This is not an easy task but working together we can achieve this goal.

A motion was made by Councilman Holzhauser, seconded by Councilwoman Sullivan, to table the issue for six weeks and directed staff to ensure multi-family housing cannot be in R1A zoning. The motion carried by a voice vote.

The meeting recessed from 9:30 p.m. - 9:34 p.m.

3. [Receive the City of Naperville Bridge to 2023 Priorities Plan fall 2022 status update](#)

Schatz presented updates on the Public Safety and Sustainability priorities and shared their status as On Track and Monitoring respectively.

Mayer presented the Financial Principles and Infrastructure/Utilities priorities update and shared that both priorities have been categorized with a status of